## Affirmative Answers to States counterplan

### Aff -- No solvency for states

#### The states don’t control the ports of entry.

Combs 2001 Window on State Government - Susan Combs, Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts 2001 State Functions at the Texas-Mexico Border and Cross-Border Transportation http://www.window.state.tx.us/specialrpt/border/sfatb2.html

II. Responsibilities of Governmental Agencies and Private Entities at the Texas-Mexico Border Crossings Several U.S. and Mexican federal, state, and local governmental and non-governmental agencies have direct and indirect roles in the Texas-Mexico border crossing process. These agencies regulate the process, enforce laws and regulations, or facilitate the safe movement of cargo and people into the United States. The U.S. General Services Administration (GSA) provides and maintains the port of entry facilities used by the federal inspection agencies and state and local agencies. GSA owns all the border stations—except for the Starr-Camargo International Bridge—and is responsible for their design and operation. The federal and state agencies operating in the border station pay rent to GSA based on the amount of space they require.[18] U.S. Federal Agencies The U.S. Customs Service and the Immigration and Naturalization Services are the primary federal agencies controlling the northbound, from Mexico into the U.S., border crossing process. They conduct primary and secondary inspections of drivers, passengers, vehicles, and cargo. Inspectors from both agencies have been authorized to perform primary inspections for both customs and immigration purposes. Primary inspections are always conducted at the border crossing. A primary inspection includes quick reviews of personal identification and citizenship, cargo documentation, and vehicle inspection. Secondary inspections are conducted at border crossing lots. Secondary inspections include more detailed reviews of cargo documentation, cargo, and drivers.

### States can’t solve Relations

#### Only a strong federal action solves the aff – the states can’t coordinate with Mexico and the perms solves any reason why state involvement is good.

Wilson & Lee 2013  
 Erik Lee, Associate Director at the North American Center for Transborder Studies (NACTS) at Arizona State University, Christopher E. Wilson, Associate at the Mexico Institute of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars “THE STATE OF TRADE, COMPETITIVENESS AND ECONOMIC WELL-BEING INTHE U.S.-MEXICO BORDER REGION” The State of The Border report: A Comprehensive Analysis of the U.S.-Mexico Border Border Research Partnership May 2013 <http://www.wilsoncenter.org/sites/default/files/mexico_state_of_border.pdf>

There is no simple answer to the complex challenge of coordinating border planning and management, but a few key ingredients for success can be identified. First, border stakeholders need to be at the table—border experts in Washington and Mexico City are no substitute for those living the implications of policy on a daily basis. Nonetheless, a strong federal role is important. Border communities often work together, but they also compete to attract federal resources and trade flows. The federal agencies are well placed to analyze and balance competing needs, especially in dialogue with border communities. Finally, and hopefully obviously, cross-border collaboration is vital. To strengthen regional competitiveness and security, we need regional coordination.

#### Only federal binational cooperation solves – state action will only make the border less economically efficient and hurt relations.

Wilson & Lee 2013  
 Erik Lee, Associate Director at the North American Center for Transborder Studies (NACTS) at Arizona State University, Christopher E. Wilson, Associate at the Mexico Institute of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars “INTRODUCTION” The State of The Border report: A Comprehensive Analysis of the U.S.-Mexico Border Border Research Partnership May 2013 <http://www.wilsoncenter.org/sites/default/files/mexico_state_of_border.pdf>

For those charged with negotiating the matrix of political and pragmatic challenges that make up the gauntlet of border policy, there are precious few axioms. Even the landmark North American Free Trade Agreement cannot quite frame the entirety of the U.S.-Mexico relationship. Through a historical process of trial and error, the two nations have arrived at, yet not fully implemented, two key concepts that can guide interaction at their shared border: coordination and collaboration. At the border, the United States and Mexico must manage complex transnational problems and remarkable shared opportunities. Watersheds and wildlife pay little attention to national boundaries, and transnational criminal groups actively seek to exploit regulatory and jurisdictional divides. But with a half-trillion dollars in bilateral trade powering the national economies throughout both countries, border management has implications that extend far beyond the border region itself. In such an environment, cooperative binational solutions are often the only solutions. Unfortunately, an institutional void exists that makes managing such complex interaction across the U.S.-Mexico border particularly challenging. While the U.S. State Department and Mexico’s Foreign Ministry formally manage federal government-to-government interaction, a large number of federal agencies, state and local governments also have a significant say in how the border is run. Chief among these is the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS), formed in the wake of the events of September 11, 2001 to better organize U.S. efforts to defend itself from terrorist attacks. The importance of DHS in border interaction cannot be overstated, and its creation represented both a securitization of the border, which made the border thicker for both illicit and legitimate traffic, but also an effort to better coordinate border management. Interagency coordination can also be difficult. Adding to this is the large number of state agencies as well as local governments that must conduct international work with their counterparts in the U.S. or Mexico. While there are formal and de facto agencies that manage our border interactions, no binational organization exists to coordinate efforts across areas such as those examined in this volume: quality of life, trade, security and environment. In a curious way, the border tends to divide east and west as often as north and south. Officials, businesses and civil society in El Paso, for instance, are generally more accustomed to reaching across the border to speak with counterparts in Ciudad Juárez to manage a shared challenge than they are to do so with those in San Diego. While the existence of these north-to-south corridors of activity are natural and beneficial, the relative lack of trans-corridor communication and collaboration can be problematic and work against formulating helpful policies for the entire region. Healthy competition among corridors to attract businesses and federal attention is a sign of a functioning market and democracy, but to the extent that border communities face common issues, they could also benefit by sharing best practices and speaking to their federal governments with a unified voice.

### States can’t solve cooperation

#### Federal action is necessary – coordinated planning is necessary to ensure that there isn’t a mismatch of investment. (Normal means includes state coordination).

Wilson & Lee 2013  
 Erik Lee, Associate Director at the North American Center for Transborder Studies (NACTS) at Arizona State University, Christopher E. Wilson, Associate at the Mexico Institute of the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars “THE STATE OF TRADE, COMPETITIVENESS AND ECONOMIC WELL-BEING INTHE U.S.-MEXICO BORDER REGION” The State of The Border report: A Comprehensive Analysis of the U.S.-Mexico Border Border Research Partnership May 2013 <http://www.wilsoncenter.org/sites/default/files/mexico_state_of_border.pdf>

A key component of how the U.S.-Mexico border functions to facilitate trade has to do with transportation planning. In the absence of strong and coordinated planning, infrastructure investments on one side of the border or in one region can simply feed traffic into a bottleneck in another area. This process is largely managed by the Joint Working Committee on Transportation Planning (JWC), a binational entity chaired by the two countries’ transportation agencies but including representatives from many federal agencies and state departments of transportation. As border communities felt themselves increasingly affected by decisions made in Washington and Mexico City, their insistence on being included in these discussions led to the regional border master plan process, in which state DOTs lead stakeholder discussions on border infrastructure priorities. While this process makes sense from a U.S. perspective (in the absence of a national transportation plan, state DOTs essentially manage and spend federal transportation dollars), this process is somewhat of a mismatch for Mexico’s more centralized political system. The system seems to work better in certain cross-border communities than others, as is seen with California and Baja California’s award-winning master plan.

#### Cooperation key to solve border problems.

Mares & Canovas 2010   
David R. Mares, University of California, San Diego Gustavo Vega Cánovas, El Colegio de México “The U.S.-Mexico Relationship: Towards a New Era?” Mexico and the United States: Confronting the Twenty-First Century http://usmex.ucsd.edu/assets/024/11646.pdf

In other words, the US and Mexico are in this struggle against crime together. The public in both countries demand that the border be better secured in both directions against the drugs, money, weapons and individuals feeding this crime. Despite the frustrations many on the US side feel as they read sensationalist press accounts, there is no way of ‘fixing’ the border that can provide security for the US without also providing it for Mexico. The expectation by some that the US can ‘seal the border’ against illicit entry of goods and individuals is simply impossible. Even making significant progress toward it would impose economic and social costs on Mexico that would create an even more desperate situation south of the border, thereby producing even greater threats to US national security. The two countries can either address these demands for security in a more effective manner (and that means doing many things differently) or divert significant human and capital resources from meeting the economic challenges of globalization into an ineffective search for security from crime. Although the levels of violence have declined in 2009 their continuation at historically high levels indicates that the level of trans-national cooperation between the Mexican and the United States governments is not optimal in this area. Given the magnitude of the violence issue, professionalizing the police and reforming the judicial system are necessary but insufficient responses. Ultimately the penal system should not simply take criminals off the streets, but deter crime. The US model of dealing with crime after the fact is too expensive (manpower, court time, jail cells and parole infrastructure) and the severely negative underlying social and economic conditions in Mexico can generate a neverending supply of criminals to overwhelm whatever judicial and police reforms the country adopts.

## Affirmative Answers to Politics-Immigration

### Case turns the DA

#### Underinvestment in ports turns the DA – negates the value of visas and migration from Mexico.

Ducheny, 6/27/2013  
 Denise Moreno Duchen is a former state senator & an immigration lawyer. Border Security? Billions Could Be Lost if Entry Ports Aren’t Improved Imperial Beach Patch, http://mexicoinstitute.wordpress.com/2013/06/28/border-security-billions-could-be-lost-if-entry-ports-arent-improved/

Our Customs and Border Patrol agents need the resources to focus on stopping drug traffickers, money launderers, arms traffickers and to build cooperation across borders to stop criminal enterprises and detect those who would seek entry anywhere in North American to endanger our citizens. Underfunding the important work done at every airport, seaport and land Port of Entry by not fully staffing these facilities is counterproductive. Failing to employ the tools of modern technology to secure cargo at the point of origin—and thereby allow billions of dollars worth of goods to flow expeditiously along roads from southern Mexico to Canada—is shortsighted at best. The pending immigration bill includes some improvements in the visa quota system that will encourage more travel across our borders with lawful documentation. It provides the opportunity for many who have worked years in the U.S. to visit family in Mexico again with travel documents that will allow them to use our Ports of Entry and avoid the clutches of smuggling operations. It provides opportunities for short-term work and return, again with full screening of documents at Ports of Entry. All of these measures—combined with a stronger, modernized system for employers to verify the work authorization of employees—will strengthen our economy and greatly reduce the incentives built into the current system that encourage unauthorized entry and visa overstay. Today more than 6 million U.S. jobs depend on our trade relationship with Mexico. More than $38 billion worth of cargo move through the Otay Mesa Port of Entry alone every year—even with the barriers presented by hours long waits and the inadequate single-lane road trucks use to reach the Port. Millions of vehicle passengers and pedestrians are asked to wait in 2- and 3-hour lines at the San Ysidro and Calexico ports of entry just to be able to spend tourist and consumer purchase dollars in California because we have failed to make the modest investments necessary to modernize these facilities and fully staff them. Over the last several years, Border Patrol staff has increased to unprecedented levels, hundreds of miles of expensive fences have been built, sensors and video surveillance cameras have been put in place. Now is the time to move to our next level of true security—creating a strong North American market where goods and consumers can travel easily about the continent, improving prosperity to the entire region, and allowing Customs and Border Protection officers to effectively do their jobs.

#### Immigration Reform fails without the plan.

Hing 2011  
 Bill Ong Hing Professor of Law University of San Francisco University of San Francisco Law Research Paper No. 2011-29 THINKING BROADLY ABOUT IMMIGRATION REFORM BY ADDRESSING ROOT CAUSES (also in book chapter in MONA PARSA AND DEBORAH ROBINSON, EDS., LEGAL BRIEFS ON IMMIGRATION REFORM FROM 25 OF THE TOP LEGAL MINDS IN THE COUNTRY, 2011). <http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1811022>

Some may find my position contradictory. In addition to legalization for the undocumented, I advocate open labor migration opportunities for nationals of NAFTA countries in the same manner as EU nationals have within the EU. That position is grounded in the rights that I believe workers should hold inherently as well as the fact that U.S. businesses need workers. On the other hand, my call for deep investment in Mexico, if heeded, will result in more employment opportunities in Mexico, encouraging Mexicans to stay home. This is important for Mexico; Mexico‘s loss of able-bodied workers is not a good idea, as Mexico will need workers to build its economy and infrastructure with the investment funds. Is this really a contradiction? I think not. First of all, since there are millions of workers involved, both outcomes can coexist; it will be a matter of balance. But in the long run, I believe that more Mexican workers will stay at home, rather than traveling to work.

### Answers to they say “DA Turns Case – Security”

#### **The DA doesn’t turn our case – the aff alone is preferable because it doesn’t build a border fence and solves the impact to the DA.**

Ducheny, 6/27/2013  
 Denise Moreno Duchen is a former state senator & an immigration lawyer. Border Security? Billions Could Be Lost if Entry Ports Aren’t Improved Imperial Beach Patch, http://mexicoinstitute.wordpress.com/2013/06/28/border-security-billions-could-be-lost-if-entry-ports-arent-improved/

As the national debate over immigration reform moves forward, we are hearing a lot of uninformed rhetoric about border security. The one portion of the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act of 2013, which has been debated on the floor of the U.S. Senate this month and succumbed to rhetoric and fear over reality and facts are the provisions related to border security. Proposed amendments seek to move it further from strategic investment to wasteful spending. The broadest, and ultimately most realistic view of our security, would acknowledge what those of us who live in places like San Diego, El Paso, Buffalo and Seattle recognize instinctively that we are not secure unless our neighbors are secure. Realistic concerns in these days of renegade terrorists, drug cartel wars and new strains of disease (remember SARS and swine flu pandemics?) cannot be confronted with fences and constricted border crossings. It depends, rather, on an increasingly integrated economic system that provides prosperity, improved quality of life, sustainable development of shared watersheds, air sheds and communities whose children grow up with the education that provides opportunities for advancement not tied to drug trafficking and other criminal enterprises. What will make us most secure is improved economic prosperity throughout North America—in the United States and for our neighbors in Canada and Mexico. The best long-term deterrent to the many who have sought employment in the U.S. by skirting the current strict quota system is to improve the economy of the North American region. We must continue to support the substantial economic growth Mexico has experienced over recent years by enhancing the trade and tourism relationship we already share. The billions of dollars proposed for so-called border Security in the legislation that received a majority vote Thursday in the Senate would be best spent to enhance the trade relationship with Mexico and Canada by investing in modernizing and building new infrastructure to facilitate the 99 percent of cross-border traffic which is legitimate, so law enforcement can focus their attention on blocking access to criminals, smugglers and those who would do us harm.

#### Without adequate border crossing infrastructure- increased border security will just push illicit movement to the ports.

Meissner, et al 2013  
 Doris Meissner, Senior Fellow and Director, MPI US Immigration Policy Program Muzaffar Chishti, Director, MPI Office at NYU School of Law Donald M. Kerwin, Executive Director, Center for Migration Studies Claire Bergeron Research Assistant with the US Immigration Policy Program at MPI, “Immigration Enforcement in the United States: The Rise of a Formidable Machinery” Migration Policy Institute http://www.migrationpolicy.org/pubs/enforcementpillars.pdf

The POE mission is arguably the most difficult and complex element of border security. CIW’s immigration inspectors question, under oath, persons seeking entry in order to determine their admissibility. POEs are responsible for both facilitation of legitimate trade and travel — which are vital for the economies and social well-being of the United States and most countries around the world — and for preventing the entry of a small but potentially deadly number of dangerous people as well as lethal goods, illicit drugs, and contraband. As border security improves and border enforcement makes illegal crossing between ports ever more difficult, the potential for misuse of legal crossing procedures builds and can be expected to steadily increase. CBP estimates that it processed more than 340 million travelers in FY 2011.172 With such volumes, inspectors have very little time on average to determine whether a traveler is authorized to enter. Covert testing by GAO at land, sea, and airport entry points from 2003-07 found that inspectors routinely failed to detect counterfeit documents or did not request documents at all.” A separate study found that the probability of an unau thorized migrant being apprehended while passing illegally through a POE was about one-half as high as the probability of being apprehended while crossing between ports of entry.”4 Persons seeking to cross illegally have growing incentives to try to enter at a POE, rather than risk their lives crossing illegally between ports.

#### Only the aff solves the weak link.

Meissner, et al 2013  
 Doris Meissner, Senior Fellow and Director, MPI US Immigration Policy Program Muzaffar Chishti, Director, MPI Office at NYU School of Law Donald M. Kerwin, Executive Director, Center for Migration Studies Claire Bergeron Research Assistant with the US Immigration Policy Program at MPI, “Immigration Enforcement in the United States: The Rise of a Formidable Machinery” Migration Policy Institute http://www.migrationpolicy.org/pubs/enforcementpillars.pdf

Meeting the physical infrastructure needs at POEs has not kept pace with advances in documentation and screening developments. Communities such as Nogales, AZ, for example, have two ports that typically handle 15,000 pedestrian and 20,000 vehicle crossings daily (3.5 million pedestrians and 4.7 million vehicles annually). The POEs are equipped with technology that permits loo percent license plate reading and document scanning. However, when traffic wait times exceed 60 minutes, inspectors typically “flush” traffic through, pulling aside only obvious high-risk crossers, in an effort to reconcile their facilitation and enforcement missions under trying conditions. Despite significant advances, land ports have not experienced improvements on par with those realized between ports. As a result, the potential for land POE inspections to be a weak link remains a critical enforcement challenge.

### Answers to they say “DA Turns Case – Economy”

#### DA doesn’t turn the case – only adequate infrastructure can address the economic problems that are the root cause.

Fischler, 2013  
Jacob Fischler covers law enforcement, courts and general assignments for The Monitor The Monitor, May 28, 2013 “Mexican trade — and tourists — are boon for U.S. businesses” http://www.themonitor.com/news/local/article\_3bf218a2-c734-11e2-b19a-001a4bcf6878.html

A study released earlier this month by NDN, a center-left think-tank based in Washington, D.C., shows trade and tourism between the two countries is at an all-time high. Trade between the two nations in 2012 was estimated at $535 billion. That number is up from $300 billion in 2009, a number that’s projected to double by this year, said Simon Rosenberg, the president of NDN. Texas leads all states with almost $200 billion in imports and exports with Mexico. Trade with Mexico sustains almost 6 million U.S. jobs, the NDN study said. In the Rio Grande Valley, tourists provide the biggest Mexican boost to the economy. “We really rely heavily on the Mexican market,” said Nancy Millar, the director of the McAllen Chamber of Commerce’s Convention and Visitors Bureau. The economic downturn in 2008 — which coincided with a spike in cartel violence — hurt Mexican tourism to the Valley, Millar said. Prior to those phenomena, 35 percent of income to McAllen’s tourism industry came from Mexico, she said, and it remains a vital part of McAllen’s economy. “There’s no doubt we have a much stronger economy than we would without them — 35 percent stronger,” she said. The NDN report called on lawmakers to use the immigration reform bill to increase the number of ports of entry and staffing of Customs and Border Protection officers at the border to expedite travel from Mexico to the U.S. “The customs department of (the Department of Homeland Security) is going to have to grow with trade and legal tourism,” Rosenberg said. “We’ve got to invest more in border infrastructure. We’ve got to cut down on wait times.” Doing so would also help eliminate barriers to further trade between the two countries, said Shannon O’Neil, a senior policy fellow for Latin American studies at the Council on Foreign Relations. And further trade means growing economies on both sides of border, particularly in areas near the border. “When a Ford plant opens in Mexico, it increases employment in the U.S.,” O’Neil said. That is because manufacturing companies take advantage of the free-trade laws that allow easy passage between North American nations to produce different parts in different places for the same finished product. “Up to 40 percent of a product that’s ‘made in Mexico’ actually comes from here originally,” she said. That’s a departure from just 10 to 20 years ago when most Mexican exports to the U.S. were natural resources like gas, she added. But reducing waiting times for Mexican tourists to enter the country is only one part of a formula to further improve trade. Border violence has to be controlled. “What’s been interesting is you’ve seen economic growth in Mexico even as security has worsened,” O’Neil said. But she doesn’t see that trend continuing. “In the long term, I don’t see how prosperity and growth that people hope for can continue if you can’t guarantee safety,” she said. “Economic growth and security have to go hand in hand.” Rosenberg believes economic growth can help bring security. “Improving the economy on both sides of the border has to be seen as part of the strategy to weaken transnational criminal organizations,” he said. “One of the ways to attack the cartels is to show that Mexicans have good jobs.”

### Answers to they say “immigration politics is a precondition to the aff”

#### Immigration reform is not a precondition to the case – cooperation with Mexico come first.

Graybeal 2011  
Michael Graybeal is the program coordinator for the Americas Program. He joined CSIS in May 2010 after receiving his M.A. in Latin American studies from Georgetown University. “Mexico's Economic Policy and Migration

Dealing with the Causes” MAY 12, 2011 Center for Strategic and International Studies http://csis.org/files/publication/110509\_Graybeal\_MexicoEconPolicy\_Web.pdf

The United States must reexamine the assumption that immigration reform is the precondition for making progress on other fronts. Doris Meissner, senior fellow at the Migration Policy Institute, argued that immigration reform may or may not happen, but most likely not in the short term. Instead, while continuing to push for immigration reform, advocates must think in new terms, focusing on the interconnectedness of the United States with Mexico and Central America. By increasing the focus on this dynamic, policymakers will increasingly recognize that immigration is a regional issue and best addressed through the lens of long-term competitiveness. By doing so, more effort could be made to address building up the region’s human capital infrastructure.

### Impact turn - Immig Bill Bad – Mexico Relations

#### The Immigration bills damages US Mexico relations because border security provisions treat Mexico as an enemy – only the plan solves.

Washington Post 6/27/13 In Mexico, dismay for the border ‘surge’ proposed in U.S. Senate immigration bill http://www.washingtonpost.com/world/the\_americas/in-mexico-dismay-for-the-border-surge-proposed-in-us-senate-immigration-bill/2013/06/27/69677776-df5a-11e2-8cf3-35c1113cfcc5\_story.html

Mexicans have reacted sorely to proposals for a border security “surge” that would put 18,000 additional federal agents and hundreds of miles of new fencing between the two neighbors, measures that were included in a package of immigration legislation approved by the Senate on Thursday. Coming less than two months after President Obama heaped praise on Mexico’s progress and its importance as a top trading partner, the Senate bill debate and the security buildup offered by the amendment, known as Corker-Hoeven, has reminded Mexicans that much of the United States views their country warily. Mexico is the largest source of illegal drugs and unauthorized migrants entering the United States. But Mexicans have bristled at a debate that has focused heavily on building new walls along the border, rather than wider doors for legitimate trade and migration to pass through. Of the estimated 11 million immigrants living unlawfully in the United States, at least 6 million are believed to be from Mexico. Mexican President Enrique Peña Nieto’s administration has kept noticeably quiet on the U.S. debate, saying only that his government supports the reform effort. However, the $46 billion in additional security measures offered by the amendment prompted Mexican officials to break their silence this week, when Foreign Minister Jose Antonio Meade told reporters here that “fences don't unite.” “Fences are not a solution to the migration phenomenon, and they are not congruent with a safe and modern border,” Meade said. “They don’t contribute to the development of a competitive region that both countries are trying to build.” Rep. Henry Cuellar (D-Tex.), whose district includes the busy border crossing of Laredo, said he has heard similar criticisms from Mexican business leaders dismayed by the “negative connotations” of additional barriers between two countries doing more than a billion dollars worth of trade each day. “You tell Mexicans that we need a border ‘surge’ and everyone thinks of the surge in Iraq, as if we’re saying they’re an enemy to overcome,” Cuellar said. “I’m for strong border security, but a fence is a 14th-century solution to a 21st-century problem.”

#### Modernization of border infrastructure is a precondition for Mexico’s cooperation on immigration reform. Only the plan solves.

Christian Science Monitor 6/26/13 Mexico breaks silence on US immigration bill: 'Walls aren't the solution '

<http://www.csmonitor.com/World/Americas/Latin-America-Monitor/2013/0626/Mexico-breaks-silence-on-US-immigration-bill-Walls-aren-t-the-solution>

US lawmakers are considering extending the border fence as part of the added security measures that would accompany plans to provide legal status to more than 11 million immigrants, the majority of them Mexican. Foreign Minister José Antonio Meade said the legislation would benefit Mexico’s countrymen in the US. But he also warned that the proposed fence extension could impact commerce, and the enormous legal flow of products and people across the border each day. “Walls aren’t the solution to the migratory phenomenon, and they aren’t congruent with a modern and secure border,” he told media on Tuesday. “They don’t contribute to the development of the competitive region that both countries want to encourage.” Seventy percent of bilateral commerce happens over the border via trucks, and it’s worth $1 million per minute, Mr. Meade said. More than 1 million people cross the US-Mexico border legally every day. Mexico has been publicly quiet in recent years on the US debate over immigration reform after former President Vicente Fox's vocal push for US reform appeared to some to be an overreach. He made specific demands, including wanting to see reform by "year end." That was in early September 2001, days before the 9/11 terrorist attacks that would set the country on a new course and see immigration reform fall by the wayside. During the current US debate, the Mexican government has kept mum – at least publicly – on the legislation, saying the debate is an internal domestic issue. But Meade said that Mexico has sustained a “permanent dialogue” with everyone involved since lawmakers began crafting the bill. “Our country has let the United States government know that measures that could affect links between [border] communities detract from the principles of shared responsibility and neighborliness that both nations agreed upon.” On the issue of shared responsibility: Over the past year, Mexico has found itself in the uncomfortable position of deterring increased illegal immigration through its own territory. Illegal immigration between Mexico and the US fell to net zero last year, meaning that the number of crossers and returnees roughly canceled each other. However, in Texas’ Rio Grande Valley, US authorities saw an increase in apprehensions of migrants – the vast majority from Honduras, Guatemala, and El Salvador, according to a report by the Washington Office on Latin America. Mexico recently announced that Marines would take over securing its southern border. As the US debate over the Border Security, Economic Opportunity and Immigration Modernization Act of 2013 gains steam, Meade noted Mexico’s requests are rooted in its desire for stronger economic development. These include the modernization of the infrastructure and administration of border ports of entry and measures that better facilitate the transit of products and people. During last month’s meeting in Mexico, Presidents Enrique Peña Nieto and Barack Obama promoted the idea of a unified economic region saying they could better compete globally, together.

#### US-Mexico relations are precondition to immigration reform solvency.

Papademetriou , Meissner, & Sohnen May 2013   
Demetrios G. Papademetriou is President and Co-Founder of the Migration Policy Institute (MPI), a Washington-based think tank dedicated exclusively to the study of international migration ; Doris Meissner, former Commissioner of the US Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), is a Senior Fellow at MPI, where she directs the Institute’s US immigration policy work. Eleanor Sohnen is a Policy Analyst at the Migration Policy Institute, where she works for the Regional Migration Study Group. Ms. Sohnen previously served as a consultant to the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) “Thinking Regionally to Compete Globally: Leveraging Migration and Human Capital in the U.S., Mexico, and Central America” Migration Policy Institute and the Wilson Center. <http://www.wilsoncenter.org/rmsg_final_report>

Such cooperation will not eliminate the asymmetrical nature of bilateral and regional relationships on migration or the inherent difficulties of coordination on the issue. Nonetheless, most observers see an unambiguous need for exploring the possibility of reaching consensus around shared goals with Mexico and in the region that govern how the pieces fit together. US immigration reform legislation, if it succeeds, will in fact have to rely on far greater cooperation with Mexico (and the other countries of interest to this effort) in the implementation of the earned legalization and “future flows” parts of the legislation. Discussion on these issues must start in earnest if the aims and benefits of the new law for the people of the region, including US citizens and residents, are to be realized. Moreover, without far more organic US-Mexico and regional consultations and cooperation on the implementation of the law, the status quo of mostly ad hoc sets of projects that lack broader strategic cohesion or meaning will continue to define how the United States works with the region, and vice versa. That would be truly a lost opportunity.

## Affirmative Answers to China DA

### No Internal Link

#### Chinese-Mexican relations are just grandstanding – there’s no actual partnership.

Chris Devonshire-Ellis , 6/7/13 principal and founding partner of Dezan Shira & Associates. The firm provides investment legal and cross border tax advice to mid-cap MNCs from the United States and Europe into China and Asia “China & Mexico Talk of Strategic Partnership Deal, But Much Remains to be Done” China Briefing <http://www.china-briefing.com/news/2013/06/07/china-mexico-talk-of-strategic-partnership-deal-but-much-remains-to-be-done.html#sthash.3CaRooza.dpuf>

These sorts of meetings, in my opinion, are an excuse for political grandstanding and media exposure. As a result, they mean very little. While the prospect of Mexican-Chinese JVs to target the U.S. market may seem appealing to both, in actual fact, the Chinese side have little incentive to do so. Mexico has no double taxation agreement (DTA) with China, meaning that Chinese investors are subject to Mexican rates of corporate income tax (CIT) and related taxes with no treaty to offset these. Mexico has a higher rate of CIT at 28 percent than China at 25 percent. Although that doesn’t sound like a huge difference – it is more than enough to eat into any available profit gains in such competitive markets. Mexico also levies immediate worldwide income tax claims on all residents – something that is not likely to sit well with Chinese investors. The two countries do have an “Agreement between the Government of the United Mexican States and the Government of the Peoples Repubic of China on the Promotion and Reciprocal Protection of Investments,” however this dates back to 2008 and the current statements do little, if anything, to expand beyond the framework within. That was penned five years ago at the time of Beijing hosting the Olympics. So this could simply be another example of an agreement written by Mexico to feed their hungry media and to show off their politicians alongside countries that are firmly in the international spotlight, because it contains little of actual substance. So what does the rhetoric actually mean? From the U.S. perspective, probably not a lot. Without any supporting tax agreements, the Mexico-China talk remains just that – talk. Chinese companies have access to U.S. markets anyway and the Mexican tax code is unattractive to them compared with lower rates back in China.

### Non Unique – US/Mexico/China

#### China is not a challenger to US economic power in Mexico.

Wang 2013, Ping Wang Director of the Center for Latin American Studies at Nankai University, Tianjin, China; senior research fellow of the Institute of Global Studies of Hong Kong and the Chinese Foreign Economic and Trade University “The Impacts of China´s Peaceful Inﬂuence on U.S.-Mexican Relations. A Triangular Perspective” In "China and the New Triangular Relationships in the Americas: China and the Future of US-Mexico Relations" 5-1-2013 Edited by: Enrique Dussel Peters, Adrian H. Hearn, Harley Shaiken (2013). University of Miami Center for Latin American Studies Publications. <http://scholarlyrepository.miami.edu/clas_publications/3>

There is no doubt that the United States is a superpower, not only among these three countries, but also in the world. Although the International Monetary Fund predicts that China will surpass the U.S. in 2016 to become the world’s largest economy, the fact remains that China is still a developing country and only one of the regional powers in Asia, unlike the United States, which is a leading global superpower. The economic performance of the United States remains very impressive. Even though the economy of the U.S. was signiﬁcantly affected by the international ﬁnancial crisis, and is still in the process of recovering from an economic recession, the United States ﬁnds itself even now in a “unipolar moment” of unchallenged superiority. Therefore, although China is referred to as the second largest economy in the world, such accolades would be dampened if China’s situation were viewed comparatively, as a whole, with the United States. It is clear that China’s economic status has been increasing in terms of purchasing power parity (PPP), which is the correct unit of measurement when examining the cost of living. However, “the traditional measure of GDP, calculated in dollars at current exchange rates, [indicates] that the U.S. economy remains nearly six times the size of China’s” (Stallings 2008:241). Furthermore, it is widely known that competitiveness indicates the level of a country’s productivity. According to a report by the World Economic Forum, the U.S. is ranked much higher than both China and Mexico (China: 26th and Mexico: 58th), even though “the U.S. continues its decline for the third year in a row, falling one more place to ﬁfth position” (WEF 2011).

### No Impact

#### China will not challenge US influence in Mexico or Latin America.

Ariel C. Armony 2013; Director of the University of Miami’s Center for Latin American Studies, designated as a Title VI National Resource Center by the U.S. Department of Education, is also the Weeks Professor in Latin American Studies and Professor of International Studies “Conclusions and Debates on the US-Mexico-China Relationship” In "China and the New Triangular Relationships in the Americas: China and the Future of US-Mexico Relations" 5-1-2013 Edited by: Enrique Dussel Peters, Adrian H. Hearn, Harley Shaiken (2013). University of Miami Center for Latin American Studies Publications. http://scholarlyrepository.miami.edu/clas\_publications/3

A careful reading of the chapters in the volume provides clues as to the features of the TR among the United States, Mexico, and China. The following list summarizes some of the most relevant features: The stability of each of the bilateral ties in the triangle: the fundamental relations in the triangle are US-Mexico and US-China. These ties play a vital role for the countries involved—in particular for Mexico’s relationship with the United States. One way in which China can affect the stability of US-Mexico ties is by posing a “hegemonic challenge” to the United States, that is, by “seeking peer status or attempting to become the new hegemon” (Paz 2012:19). China’s consistent strategy of restraint in Latin America and the US-China institutionalized dialogue on Latin America, among other factors, suggest that China will not rise to challenge the hegemony of the United States in Latin America any time soon.2

#### There’s no trade off or competition between China and the US in Latin America.

Chunsi Wu 2013 Chunsi Wu is the executive director of the Institute of International Strategy Studies and research fellow at the Center for American Studies, Shanghai Institutes for International Studies (SIIS). “U.S.-Mexico-China Relations in the Context of Regional Cooperation: A Chinese Perspective” In "China and the New Triangular Relationships in the Americas: China and the Future of US-Mexico Relations" 5-1-2013 Edited by: Enrique Dussel Peters, Adrian H. Hearn, Harley Shaiken (2013). University of Miami Center for Latin American Studies Publications. http://scholarlyrepository.miami.edu/clas\_publications/3

Secondly, although the U.S. pays close attention to China’s engagement with Latin American countries, it knows that China does not really have the capability to challenge the position of the United States on the American continent. It is true that Chinese-Latin American relations have developed rapidly over the past ten years, especially in regards to three aspects: Firstly, China has established connections with the entire American continent, not only developing economic relations with the major powers in the region, but also strengthening its cooperation with many medium-sized countries as well as regional organizations. Some countries in the region, however, do not maintain diplomatic relations with Mainland China, and do with Taiwan. Secondly, China has begun to pursue universal cooperation with Latin American nations, with more and more dimensions emerging in its various relationships including tourism, cultural exchange, security issues, climate change, etc. Thirdly, topics of interest between China and Latin American countries have gone beyond the bilateral and regional levels, with these nations exchanging views on the world order and global affairs. Thus, China believes that its relationship with Latin America has “strategic importance.”2 Certain Chinese scholars have pointed out that the Chinese-Latin American relationship has exhibited unprecedented growth in the new century (Zheng and Sun 2009). China’s increasing reinforcement of its relationship with Latin American countries, however, does not imply any intention to enter into geopolitical competition with the United States. Economic development is the primary goal of China’s cooperation with Latin American countries. Indeed, China wants to expand its exchange with Latin American countries to include other areas such as education, culture, politics, security, etc., given China’s belief that one-dimensional relationships are both unhealthy and unsustainable. Chinese-Latin American economic cooperation needs to be both complemented and supported by diplomacy in other areas. Therefore, from the Chinese perspective, developing comprehensive relationships with Latin American countries has little to do with strategic or military competition.

## A2 –K

#### The perm solves – only affirming the border as a connective membrane between the US and Mexico solves the impact to the K.

Dear, 2013

Michael Dear is a professor in the College of Environmental Design at UC Berkeley. The author/editor of more than a dozen books, he has been a Guggenheim Fellowship holder, a Fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford, and Fellow at the Rockefeller Center in Bellagio, Italy. “Kafka at the border

” The Berkeley Blog 3/18/13 <http://blogs.berkeley.edu/2013/03/18/kafka-at-the-border/>

Residents on both sides of the line regard parts of Mexico and the US as their home. For them, the border is a connective membrane, not a line of demarcation. They have more in common with each other than with their host nations, describing themselves as “transborder citizens” oblivious to which side of the border they’re on. This place is distinctive enough to warrant the title of “third nation,” slotted snugly in-between two countries. Besides sentiments of belonging and shared destiny, the third nation is bolstered by synergistic local economies. Border states are among the fastest-growing regions in both countries. Ciudad Juárez, once a city of 1.5 million, lost about a quarter-million inhabitants who fled from drug cartel-related violence to various destinations across Mexico. Yet the city’s industries continue to add jobs, and trade between Juárez and Texas rose almost 50 percent in 2010. In El Paso, the arrival of 30,000 sanctuary-seekers from Juárez created a boom in real estate and restaurant businesses. Cross-border institutions also reinforce bi-national ties. For more than a century, the International Boundary and Water Commission in El Paso has shared responsibility with its Mexican counterpart for maintaining the boundary line and supporting joint development projects. The Commissions make vital contributions to bi-national stability and prosperity. Border communities have been placed in an untenable situation. They are obliged to host an enforcement infrastructure that undermines their well-being. In return DHS has offered little, creating instead a bizarre world of splintered lives, occupying armies, drones, and pulverized landscapes awash with the detritus of partition. The walls separating Mexico and the US are manifestations of failed diplomacy. They do not work, and will come down. The Berlin Wall was demolished virtually overnight, its fragments sold as souvenirs of a calamitous Cold War; and the Great Wall of China became a global tourist attraction. Left untended, the US-Mexico Wall would collapse under the combined assault of avid recyclers, souvenir hunters, and antagonistic residents. Nevertheless, we should preserve sections of the Wall to commemorate that fraught moment in history when the US lost its moral compass.

#### The aff solves interconnections across the border – these connection are a necessary precondition to breaking down fears of border insecurity, immigration and so on.

Dear, 2013  
Michael Dear is a professor in the College of Environmental Design at UC Berkeley. The author/editor of more than a dozen books, he has been a Guggenheim Fellowship holder, a Fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford, and Fellow at the Rockefeller Center in Bellagio, Italy. “Building connections (not more walls) along the U.S.-Mexico border” The Berkeley Blog 5/15/13 http://blogs.berkeley.edu/2013/05/15/building-connections-not-more-walls-along-the-u-s-mexico-border/

As the immigration debate heats up in Washington, D.C., and around the country, various interest groups are lining up to make sure they get what they want from reform, whether it’s more fences, protections for American workers, visas for qualified high-tech workers, or increased immigration quotas for specific nations. One important group has so far been overlooked during current debates on immigration reform — the people who actually live along the U.S.-Mexico boundary line. For them, the border is a connecting tissue, not a divide. The mayors of San Diego and Tijuana understand this, which is why they are working together to realize a shared destiny for their ‘twin cities.’ A centuries-old cross-border mentality unites twin cities along the entire length of borderline, including El Paso/Ciudad Juárez, and Brownsville/Matamoros. Such bi-national collaborations not only benefit localities, they also make vital contributions to international stability and prosperity. Cross-border connections are often informal and spontaneous. For instance, the Mexican village of Boquillas del Carmen (in the state of Chihuahua) was devastated by the loss of tourist income that followed the closing of the border after 9/11. However, it was not long before folks in Terlingua (Texas) began collecting fabric for Boquillas neighbors to sew into quilts for sale back in Terlingua. The money earned from these sales was turned over to the residents of Boquillas to help them weather the economic downturn. More formal cross-border institutions also consolidate bi-national ties, including local business alliances as well as international agreements on trade and environment. In El Paso, the International Boundary and Water Commission and its Mexican counterpart, Comisión Internacional de Límites y Aguas, for more than a century have shared responsibility for maintaining the international boundary line and supporting joint development projects. Their efforts have cleaned up the river-borne pollution that crosses over from the city of Tijuana into San Diego County, protected environmentally-sensitive desert regions between Texas and Chihuahua, and forged important water-sharing agreements pertaining to the Colorado River. Every single day, trans-border unity is further bolstered by the synergies of twin-city economies. Border states are among the fastest-growing regions in both countries. Ciudad Juárez, once a city of 1.5 million, lost about a quarter-million inhabitants who fled from drug cartel-related violence. Yet Juárez’s industrial sector continues to add jobs, and trade between the city and Texas rose almost 50 percent in 2010. In El Paso, the arrival of 30,000 sanctuary-seekers from Juárez created a boom in local real estate and restaurant businesses. In McAllen, Texas, 80 percent of businesses were Mexican-owned by the mid-2000s, a reversal of the proportion from a decade earlier. McAllen draws a greater share of Mexican spending than any other US city, affecting everything from retail sales to home purchases and vacation destinations. Most of the money comes from the major industrial metropolis of Monterrey in Nuevo Léon, only two hours away by toll road. So common is the trip from Monterrey to McAllen that a new Spanish verb was coined: macalenear, literally ‘to do McAllen.’ The troubles in Ciudad Juárez remind us that cross-border connectivity is not solely about positive connections. Drug smuggling and human trafficking across the line are never welcomed, but they nevertheless constitute another kind of cross-border linkage. In turn, they have spawned new forms of collaboration among law enforcement agencies on both sides. Today, U.S. Border Patrol agents in the Texan Big Bend region worry because Mexico’s plans for infrastructure improvement (to transport goods more expeditiously into the US) could expose the remote region to an influx of criminal activity. But the US has not yet moved to upgrade regional transportation infrastructure north of the border. Oblivious to the needs of trans-border communities, reform-minded lawmakers in distant Washington, D.C. persist in demanding yet more barricades between our two countries. Instead, we should be listening to the voices of border residents on both sides, following the lead of twin-city mayors, and working harder to strengthen cross-border ties. Mexico is already ahead of us in developing the border-zone infrastructure needed for bi-national trade and prosperity. Why aren’t we matching these efforts? Paradoxically, our national obsessions regarding security, immigration, and drugs may best be served by encouraging cross-border connections instead of building more fortifications that interrupt transborder lives, jeopardize economic prosperity, and downgrade environmental and community well-being along the line.